DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 776 CS 503 290

AUTHOR Bendelow, Mary Margaret
TITLE Perceptions of Male and Female Dominant Behavior in Small Group Interactions.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (San Jose, CA, February 14-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attribution Theory; Behavior; *Behavioral Science Research; College Students; Communication Research; Females; Group Dynamics; *Individual Characteristics; *Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; Males; *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS *Dominant Behavior

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine how males and females were perceived when using identical dominant behaviors. The subjects, 360 college students, viewed one of six stimulus drawings of groups of four seated people and indicated their attributions of dominant behavior on 22 bipolar perceptual scales. Analyses were conducted to create and compare profiles of perceptions attributed to the dominant-acting person in each condition stimulus. In all, five conclusions were drawn from the data: (1) dominant behavior was perceived as a "masculine" trait, and having leadership designation increased such a perception; (2) leadership designation was crucial to those who sought to be seen as influential in groups; (3) the sex of the dominant-acting person was important, although leadership designation had an overriding influence; (4) leadership designation was important for males and females for different reasons--males needed such designation to be seen as intelligent in comparison with other males and as possessing a variety of leadership attributes, while females needed leadership designation to lessen the possibility of their behavior being seen as other than feminine or as extradominant; and (5) perceptions of males and females in situations with role ambiguity emphasized the need for leadership designation. As role ambiguity increased, perceptions of males and females tended more toward the stereotypic, especially for females. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199776

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERCEPTIONS OF MALE AND FEMALE DOMINANT BEHAVIOR IN SMALL GROUP INTERACTIONS

Mary Margaret Bendelow

University of Colorado

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Margaret Bendelow

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented to the Western Speech Communication Association Convention

February, 1981

CS503290

As women and men have begun to explore the possibilities of alternative roles and lifestyles, social scientists have shown an increasing interest in examining the dynamics of being male and female in our society. Interest in the field of communication has focused on the interpersonal aspects of sex differences as these are evidenced in both verbal and nonverbal communication. Characteristic behaviors of both males and females have been identified, and with the cataloguing of these behaviors an appreciation for their significance has also developed.

According to small group research, males are expected to be and are supported from being task-oriented, aggressive, and competitive in groups, women, for being passive, emotional, and dependent (Baird, 1976). Both male and female communication styles reinforce these stereotypic expectations. Male nonverbal behavior includes interrupting, taking up space, touching others, and staring aggressively (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Henley, 1977). Females, in contrast, are characteristically passive in their communication style. They yield to others' interruptions and invasions of space, compress their postures and movements, allow touches, and adopt a tense listening posture (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Henley, 1977).

It has become apparent that more than coincidence or idiosyncracy link typical male behaviors with dominance in a group and typical female behaviors with nondominance. The nonverbal behaviors which characterize dominance in groups are the same ones which characterize male behavior, and those behaviors which characterize nondominance in groups are those which also characterize

female behavior (Mehrabian, 1969; Frieze & Ramsey, 1976; Baird, 1976).

The conclusion that certain behaviors are characteristic of dominance in groups has given support to the idea that anyone who uses them will be seen as dominant. This has created more than a few problems for those women who, in the interest of acquiring the influence such behavior apparently gains men, adopt male behaviors without being aware of their potential impact. Women have found that other responses than recognition of their dominance are possible when using a characteristic male behavior--they may be seen as too aggressive or as not aggressive at all (Frieze & Ramsey, 1976; Henley, 1977; Henley & Freeman, 1975; Eakins & Eakins, 1978). In either case, they are not perceived as powerful and influential people.

These two possible interpretations of a woman's dominant behavior have been theorized, but research investigating these stereotypes is limited. The purpose of the present study was to determine more precisely the nature of the responses to a female using a male behavior. The focus in this inquiry was on particular characteristics of behavior and of group membership which are traditionally the purvue of males--nonverbal dominant behavior and leadership designation. The two purposes of this study were (1) to determine if males and females were seen as significantly different under comparable conditions, and (2) to ascertain the nature of the attributes given to male and female leaders and dominant-acting non-leaders in groups.

In investigating this question, four relationships were hypothesized. The first three hypotheses provided for direct comparison of overall perceptions of males and females who used identical behaviors under comparable leadership conditions.

Hypothesis I

There will be a significant difference between observers' perceptions of a dominant-acting male, designated leader, and their perceptions of a dominant-acting female, designated leader.

Hypothesis II

There will be a significant difference between observers' perceptions of a dominant0acting male, not designated leader, and their perceptions of a dominant-acting female, not designated leader.

Hypothesis III

There will be a significant difference between observers' perceptions of a dominant-acting male and their perceptions of a dominant-acting female when each is in a group with no designated leader.

A fourth relationship was also hypothesized, in order to determine if the combination of being a dominant-acting male and having leadership designation resulted in significantly different perceptions when compared to all other combinations of sex and leadership designation used in this study.

Hypothesis IV

There will be a significant difference between observers' perceptions of a dominant-acting male, designated leader, and their perceptions of any other combination of sex and leadership designation used in this study. Specifically, the comparisons are between a dominant-acting male, designated leader, and

a. a dominant-acting female, designated leader;

b. a dominant-acting male, not designated leader;

c. a dominant-acting female, not designated leader;

d. a dominant-acting male in a group with no designated leader; and

e. a dominant-acting female in a group with no designated leader.

In order to explore further the specifics of people's perceptions of dominant-acting males and females, profiles of the attributes given to males and females were constructed.

Method

Subjects

The subjects in the study were 360 undergraduate students enrolled in communication courses at the University of Colorado at Boulder in spring, 1979. Participation in the study was voluntary.

Design

The intent of the study was to determine how males and females were perceived when using identical dominant behaviors. The particular context used in this study was that of a group of four seated people which was composed of varying combinations of males and females. In some groups, leadership was specified. This context was chosen because it is typical for professional men and women. It also is one in which males are usually perceived as dominant. The context was presented by means of drawings and written descriptions. Subjects viewed the drawing given to them and indicated their attributions on a series of bi-polar scales.

Three independent variables and one dependent variable were operationalized in this study. Sex of dominant-acting person was the central concept in this

study. Both a male and a female were depicted using the same dominant behavior, which was touching. Leadership designation was specified in an accompanying paragraph to the picture, and was stated as being given either to the dominant-acting person, to someone in the group besides the dominant-acting person, or to no one in the group. Group composition was varied throughout the study for the sake of generalizability; no predictions were made concerning its effect on perceptions. The groups in the stimulus drawings consisted of three males and one female, three females and one male, or two of each. In three of the combinations a male was portrayed doing the touching, and in the other three a female. Thus, this variable was operationalized by means of six drawings. With all the combinations of the three independent variables in the 2 x 3 x 3 factorial design, there were eighteen cells of analysis, each of which utilized twenty subjects.

The dependent variable in the study was the subjects' perceptions and attributions of dominant behavior, operationalized via their responses on each of twenty-two bi-polar perceptual scales.

A pilot study was conducted to determine both the stimulus drawings and the particular perceptual scales to use in the main study. Four behaviors were tested in the pilot study. Three of them--touching, pointing, arms folded on chest--were chosen based on research in nonverbal dominant behavior (Mehrabian, 1969). The fourth behavior--backwards leaning with feet outstretched and fingers laced behind head--was used for comparison even though it was not a dominant behavior. Each of the four postures was tested in all of the four positions in the group, for a total of sixteen drawings used in the pilot study. Based on subjects' responses when asked to indicate the dominant person

in the group, a cross-tabulation of responses was done which specified both the behavior (touching) and the position in the group which was seen as the most dominant. The combination of these two was used in the main study by both a male and a female figure to indicate dominance in the group. The other three figures in the group were portrayed in the main study as comparatively tense and erect, their bodies and eye contact oriented towards the person doing the touching.

The twenty-two perceptual scales were chosen from an original list of thirty-seven bi-polar scales, itself derived from the literature on sex role stereotypes (Baird, 1976). By means of factor analysis using varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization, the list of scales was narrowed to a more focused twenty-two. The scales consisted of bi-polar "masculine" and "feminine" attributes stereotypic of males and females in groups, e.g., aggressive/passive, leader/follower, straightforward/manipulative. Based on previous research, it was assumed that perceptions of dominance would be connected to perceptions of "male-ness." Therefore, those behaviors which would be expected or receive support when demonstrated by a male were placed on the "masculine" end of the scales, as were positive evaluative attributes such as "good" and "likeable" which would support their use by males. At the other end of the scales were those qualities stereotypic of "female-ness." Included there were attributions pertaining to low dominance, as well as socio-emotional qualities considered appropriate for a female. Since the use of a dominant behavior by females in the study was considered to be out-of-role, it was assumed that negative evaluative attributes would belong at the "feminine" end of the scale. Figure 1 presents a listing of the twenty-two scales used in the Attributes Accompanying Perceptions of Dominance (AAPD) instrument.

	"Masculine" Attributes	"Feminine" Attributes
1.	intelligent	unintelligent
2.	dominant	nondominant
3.	unemotional	emotional
4.	enjoys arguing	does not enjoy arguing
5.	generally initiates action	follows others' lead
6.	nonflirtatious	flirtatious
7.	likeable	not likeable
8.	strong-willed	weak-willed
9.	unlikely to ask for help	likely to ask for help
10.	appears self-assured	does not appear self-assured
11.	unconcerned with others' feelings	concerned with others' feelings
12.	aggressive	timid
13.	tries to have last word	does not try to have last word
14.	unsympathetic	sympathetic
15.	important to group task	unimportant to group task
16.	decisive	indecisive
17.	straightforward	manipulative
18.	outgoing	shy
19.	talkative	quiet
20.	good	bad
21.	competent	incompetent
22.	leader	follower

FIGURE 1

ATTRIBUTIONS ACCOMPANYING PERCEPTIONS OF DOMINANCE (AAPD)

Task

Each subject viewed one of six stimulus drawings, where leadership designation was or was not given to a particular group member. Following the picture was the set of perceptual scales, and subjects were asked to rate each of the four figures in the drawing on all of the twenty-two scales. They were also asked to indicate which of the four figures in the group they perceived to be dominant. Completion of the experimental task took about fifteen minutes.

Data Analysis

Each of the seven points on the perceptual scales was given a value from 1.00 ("feminine") to 7.00 ("masculine"). Any scale left blank was given a value of zero and was included in the averages. Only responses which concerned the figure doing the touching were employed in the statistical analyses.

In the analyses which tested the hypotheses, the scores on all twenty-two scales were averaged together, in order to determine whether or not, as a whole, males and females were perceived differently. In these analyses, the distinctions created by the variable "group composition" were not needed, and so all scores for a particular sex and a particular leadership designation were combined. In testing the hypotheses, the main and interactive effects were determined by use of analysis of variance. In those cases where the analysis of variance indicated significant effects, t-tests were completed to create a set of profiles by individual scale. That is, the twenty-two scores which had been combined to create a composite mean for overall comparisons were subdivided into the original scores for particular comparisons. The result of the comparisons was a profile of perceptions attributed to the dominant-acting person in each condition where comparisons were done in the study.

Results

Table I indicates the results of the analyses of variance which tested the first three hypotheses, none of which were supported ($p \geq .19$ in all cases).

TABLE I

RESULTS OF ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR SEX OF DOMINANT-ACTING PERSON BY LEADERSHIP DESIGNATION SPECIFIED

	Means			
	DAM	DAF	F	p
Hypothesis I: Leadership Designation to Dominant-acting Person	5.08	4.98	1.14	.29
Hypothesis II: Leadership Designation to Someone Other than Dominant-acting Person	4.76	4.70	.372	.42
Hypothesis III: No Designated Leader in Group	4.91	4.78	1.73	.19

Note: Scores range from 1.00 ("feminine") to 7.00 ("masculine")

Table II summarizes the results of the analysis of variance for the fourth hypothesis. There were significant differences between the male leader and the following: the male non-leader ($F=13.512$, $p=.0002$), the female non-leader ($F=18.721$, $p=.00001$), the male in a leaderless group ($F=3.901$, $p=.0485$), and the

TABLE II

RESULTS OF ANALYSES OF VARIANCE
COMPARING A DAM, DESIGNATED LEADER, WITH ALL OTHER COMBINATIONS
OF SEX AND LEADERSHIP DESIGNATION SPECIFIED IN THIS STUDY

DAM, Designated leader (mean 1) compared to _____ (mean 2)	Means 1	2	F	p
a. DAM, Designated Leader	5.08	4.98	1.14	.29
b. DAM, Not Designated Leader	5.08	4.76	13.512	.0002*
c. DAF, Not Designated Leader	5.08	4.70	18.721	.00001*
d. DAM, No Designated Leader in Group	5.08	4.91	3.901	.0485*
e. DAF, No Designated Leader in Group	5.08	4.78	10.91	.001*

Note: Scores range from 1.00 ("feminine")to 7.00 ("masculine")
Note: DAM and DAF refer to dominant-acting male and female, respectively
*Results were significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence

female in a leaderless group (F=10.91, p=.001). When compared to the female leader, however, the difference was not significant.

To determine if the strength of these comparisons came from the variable of leadership designation rather than sex of dominant-acting person, further comparisons were done, using the female leader as the basis. Table III summarizes the results of these comparisons. There were significant differences between the female leader and: the male non-leader (F=6.879, p=.0089), the female non-leader (F=10.6551, p=.0011), and the female in a leaderless group (F=5.0401,

TABLE III

RESULTS OF ANALYSES OF VARIANCE COMPARING A DAF, DESIGNATED LEADER, WITH REMAINING COMBINATIONS OF SEX AND LEADERSHIP DESIGNATION

DAF, Designated Leader (mean 1) compared to _____ (mean 2)	Means 1	Means 2	F	p
DAM, Not Designated Leader	4.98	4.76	6.879	.0089*
DAF, Not Designated Leader	4.98	4.70	10.6551	.0011*
DAM, No Designated Leader in Group	4.98	4.91	.8429	.3588
DAF, No Designated Leader in Group	4.98	4.78	5.0401	.025*

Note: Scores range from 1.00 ("feminine") to 7.00 ("masculine")
Note: DAM and DAF refer to dominant-acting male and female, respectively
*Results were significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence

p=.025). When compared to the male in a leaderless group, however, the difference was not significant.

Because both the male leader and the female leader were each perceived as significantly different in most comparisons with other conditions in the study, but were not perceived as significantly different from each other, it was concluded that leadership designation and not sex of dominant-acting person was the salient factor in the differences found. Hypothesis IV, therfore, was not supported.

Supplementary analyses were performed in those cases where the analyses

of variance used to test each hypothesis indicated that significant overall differences existed, that is, in the case of Hypothesis IV and its cross-check. In the supplementary analyses, the composite scores which had been used to compare overall differences were broken down into their component parts by scale. In this way, profiles of responses were created which made it possible to determine the specifics of the attributes given to dominant-acting male and female leaders, when compared to other combinations of sex and leadership designation. While the possibility exists, of course, that some of the significant results profiled in Tables IV and V may be spurious because of the re-use of the same data in different comparisons, this was not considered to be significant in this study since its intent was exploratory. The conclusions reached here can be viewed as descriptive rather than predictive, and warrant further investigation in a more focused study where more specific hypotheses would be tested.

Comparisons with Male Leaders

As Table II indicated, significant overall differences were found in comparisons between the male leader and four of the five other combinations of sex and leadership designation. Table IV indicates the specifics of these overall differences. Comparisons were made by individual scale, and the resulting profile given in Table IV summarizes only the significant individual comparisons.

The qualities which distinguished the male leader from male and female non-leaders, though similar in some respects, differed in significant ways. In common in these comparisons were certain qualities related to activity in a group, for the male leader was seen as more of an initiator of action (t for

TABLE IV

PROFILES FOR COMPARISONS WITH DAM, DESIGNATED LEADER,
SHOWING ONLY THOSE SCALES WHERE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS INDICATED

Scale Number	Mean for DAM, Leader	DAM, Not Leader			DAF, Not Leader			DAM, No Leader			DAF, No Leader		
		mean	t	p	mean	t	p	mean	t	p	mean	t	p
1	5.58	4.98	2.00	.048				4.92	1.99	.049			
3	2.23				1.70	2.10	.038						
5	6.57	5.92	2.75	.007	6.00	2.40	.018						
6	2.62				1.80	2.97	.004	1.88	2.59	.011			
8	6.05										5.40	2.27	.025
9	4.47	3.57	2.23	.028	3.52	2.41	.017						
10	6.40	5.68	2.70	.008									
11	2.67										1.92	2.27	.025
14	3.35				2.42	2.76	.007				2.07	3.85	.0001
15	6.35	5.73	2.39	.018	5.77	2.39	.018	5.73	2.52	.013			
17	2.55	3.42	-2.04	.044	3.38	-2.10	.038						
18	6.20				5.52	1.99	.049						
22	6.38	5.68	2.73	.007	5.77	2.34	.021						

Note: Scores range from 1.00 ("feminine") to 7.00 ("masculine").

male non-leader: 2.75, p=.007; t for female non-leader:2.40, p=.018); less likely to ask for help (t for male non-leader: 2.23, p=.028; t for female non-leader: 2.41, p=.017); more important to the group task (t for both male and female non-leader: 2.39, p=.018); and more of a leader (t for male non-leader: 2.73, p=.007; t for female non-leader: 2.34, p=.021). Manipulation, a quality not stereotypically attributed to males, was also seen as significant in these comparisons (t for male non-leader: -2.04, p=.044; t for female non-leader: -2.10, p=.038).

Additional qualities which distinguished a male leader from a male non-leader indicated that the male leader was seen as more intelligent (t=2.03, p=.043) and more self-assured (t=2.70, p=.008). In contrast, in comparisons with the female non-leader, the male leader was seen as less emotional (t=2.10, p=.038), less flirtatious (t=2.97, p=.004), less sympathetic (t=2.76, p=.007), and more outgoing (t=1.99, p=.049).

In comparisons involving the male leader and the male and female in a leaderless group, only three attributes distinguished each from the male leader, and there was no overlapping of salient qualities. In comparison with the male in a leaderless group, the male leader was seen as more intelligent (t=1.99, p=.049), less flirtatious (t=2.59, p=.011), and more important to the group task (t=2.52, p=.013). In comparison to the female in a leaderless group, the male leader was seen as more strong-willed (t=2.27, p=.025), less concerned with others' feelings (t=2.27, p=.025), and less sympathetic (t=3.85, p=.00001).

Comparisons with Female Leaders

As Table III indicated, significant overall differences were found in comparisons between the female leader and three of the four other combinations of sex and leadership designation to which she was compared in the cross-check.

The profile in Table V summarizes the significant individual differences resulting from comparisons by individual scales.

The pattern of attributes concerning the female leader was similar in many respects to the pattern of responses concerning the male leader. Comparisons between the female leader and the male and female non-leaders shared some common attributes. In both sets of comparisons, the female leader was seen as more of an initiator of action (t for male non-leader: 3.13, $p=.002$; t for female non-leader: 2.75, $p=.007$); more strong-willed (t for male non-leader: 2.25, $p=.026$; t for female non-leader: 2.05, $p=.043$); and more important to the group task (t for male non-leader: 3.04, $p=.003$; t for female non-leader: 3.08, $p=.003$).

Additional qualities which distinguished a female leader from a male non-leader indicated that the female leader was seen as more self-assured ($t=2.33$, $p=.022$) and more decisive ($t=2.03$, $p=.045$). In contrast, in comparison with the female non-leader, the female leader was seen as less emotional ($t=3.16$, $p=.002$), less flirtatious ($t=2.91$, $p=.004$), less likely to ask for help ($t=2.07$, $p=.041$), and more competent ($t=2.21$, $p=.029$).

Three attributes were significant in comparisons of the female leader and the female in a leaderless group. The female leader was seen as more strong-willed ($t=2.62$, $p=.010$), less concerned with others' feelings ($t=2.05$, $p=.042$), and more important to the group task ($t=2.39$, $p=.019$). No profiles of comparisons between the female leader and the male in a leaderless group were done because, as Table III indicated, no overall differences were found.

Comparisons with Leaders

Since it was concluded from the analyses of variance that had tested Hypothesis IV that leadership designation and not sex of dominant-acting person

TABLE V

PROFILES FOR COMPARISONS WITH DAF, DESIGNATED LEADER,
SHOWING ONLY THOSE SCALES WHERE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS INDICATED

Scale Number	Mean for DAF, Leader	DAM, Not Leader			DAF, Not Leader			DAF, No Leader		
		mean	t	p	mean	t	p	mean	t	p
3	2.55				1.70	3.16	.002			
5	6.60	5.92	3.13	.002	6.00	2.75	.007			
6	2.63				1.80	2.91	.004			
8	6.15	5.47	2.25	.026	5.62	2.05	.043	5.40	2.62	.010
9	4.32				3.52	2.07	.041			
10	6.28	5.68	2.33	.022						
11	2.53							1.92	2.05	.042
15	6.52	5.73	3.04	.003	5.77	3.08	.003	5.90	2.39	.019
16	5.90	5.27	2.03	.045						
21	5.53				4.72	2.21	.029			

Note: Scores range from 1.00 ("feminine") to 7.00 ("masculine")

was the determining factor in the overall differences found, a further profile was created which combined the data for males and females under their respective leadership designations in order to create a profile of "leader," that is, a person who acts dominant and is the designated leader of a group. Table VI presents the results of these comparisons.

Fully half of the twenty-two qualities described in the perceptual scales were seen as salient when a leader was compared with a non-leader. In these comparisons, the leader was seen as more intelligent (t=2.24, p=.026), more of an initiator of action (t=3.90, p=.0001), more strong-willed (t=2.80,p=.006), less likely to ask for help (t=3.05, p=.003), more self-assured (t=2.50, p=.013), more important to the group task (t=3.87, p=.0001), more competent (t=2.56, p=,011), and more of a leader (t=3.05, p=.003). All of these qualities were considered to be "masculine" in this study, and the leader was perceived as having them to a greater degree than the non-leader. In the remaining comparisons between the leader and the non-leader, the leader was seen as less emotional (t=2.43, p=.016), less flirtatious (t=2.98, p=.003), and more manipulative (t= -2.30, p=.022).

In the last profile, where the leader was compared to a leaderless group member, only two qualities were salient. In this profile, the leader was seen as less dominant (t= -1.98, p=.049), and more important to the group task (t= 3.48, p=.001).

Discussion

It is significant that none of the hypotheses were supported. The findings would seem to underscore the need for leadership designation for both males and

TABLE VI

PROFILES FOR COMPARISONS WITH LEADERSHIP DESIGNATION TO DOMINANT-ACTING PERSON, SHOWING ONLY THOSE SCALES WHERE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS INDICATED

Scale Number	Mean for Leadership Designation to Dominant-Acting Person	Leadership Designation to Other than Dominant-Acting Person			No Leadership Designation in Group		
		mean	t	p	mean	t	p
1	5.57	5.08	2.24	.026			
2	5.60				6.08	-1.98	.049
3	2.39	1.90	2.43	.016			
5	6.58	5.96	3.90	.0001			
6	2.63	1.98	2.98	.003			
8	6.10	5.54	2.80	.006			
9	4.39	3.54	3.05	.003			
10	6.34	5.93	2.50	.013			
15	6.43	5.75	3.87	.0001	5.82	3.48	.001
17	2.73	3.40	-2.30	.022			
21	5.45	4.79	2.56	.011			
22	6.30	5.73	3.05	.003			

Note: Scores range from 1.00 ("feminine") to 7.00 ("masculine").

females. No significant differences were found in observers' overall perceptions when males and females with equivalent leadership designations were compared to each other, that is, when both were dominant-acting and were designated leader, when both were dominant-acting in a group where someone else was the designated leader, or when both were dominant-acting in a leaderless group. Significant differences were found in overall perceptions when dominant-acting males and females who were the designated leaders were compared with other combinations of sex and leadership designation in the study. However, in these comparisons it was concluded that these differences were attributable more to leadership designation than they were to sex of dominant-acting person. Thus, the need for having leadership designation was underscored. The profiles which resulted from the supplementary analyses reinforced this conclusion. In those profiles, most of the distinctions made between male/female leaders, and the males/females with whom they were compared, centered around leadership qualities such as "importance to group task" and "more of a leader than a follower." The sex of the dominant-acting person was not unimportant, however. When combined with having or not having leadership designation in the profiled comparisons, different kinds of qualities became salient for males and for females.

What distinguished a male leader from a male non-leader generally were qualities associated with leadership and activity in a group, for the leader was seen as more of a leader, more of an initiator, more important to the group task, more intelligent, more self-assured, and more unlikely to ask for help than was the non-leader. The leader was also seen as more manipulative, a quality not usually associated with male leadership. Comparisons between a

male leader and a female non-leader shared a number of these same leadership qualities. In these comparisons, the male leader was seen as more important to the group task, more of a leader, more of an initiator, more unlikely to ask for help, and more manipulative. Other qualities were important in these comparisons. The male leader was seen as less emotional, less flirtatious, less sympathetic, and more outgoing than the female non-leader. Thus, when comparing male leaders with female non-leaders, socioemotional as well as leadership qualities became important which was not the case when males were compared with males.

The male leader, in comparison with the male in a leaderless group, was seen as more intelligent, more important to the group task, and less flirtatious. In this set of comparisons, only three qualities distinguished a male leader from a male in a leaderless group, whereas seven qualities had distinguished a male leader from a male non-leader, and nine qualities a male leader from a female non-leader. The smaller number may indicate that observers did not perceive many differences between a male leader and a male in a leaderless group. Perhaps acting dominant when someone else was the leader in the group was seen as "worse" than acting dominant when no one was the leader, as observers found it comparatively eariser to distinguish in the former case than the latter. The kinds of distinctions made in each set of comparisons differed, as well. When the male leader was compared with the male non-leader, leadership qualities were at the center of focus. When comparisons were made between a male leader and a male in a leaderless group, however, only one leadership quality was important along with two personality variables. Thus distinctions concerning leadership behavior by and large were not as important in this set of comparisons. Given the stereotypic support that is given for "take charge" behavior by males in groups, this is not surprising. According to current research, males are expected to be

and are supported for being leaders in groups. Therefore, they would be perceived similarly to male leaders when they act dominant where the leadership role is ambiguous. Implicitly, they have that role anyway.

When the male leader was compared to the female in a leaderless group, again only three qualities distinguished them. The male leader was seen as more strong-willed, less concerned with others' feelings, and less sympathetic than was the female. This narrowing of number and focus of criteria paralleled what happened when male leaders were compared with males, and it also emphasized the stereotypic expectations for males and females. As in the comparisons of males with males, as role ambiguity increased, the number of distinguishing criteria decreased. In the case of comparisons with females, however, the perceptions became more focused and emphasized the stereotypic. That is, the female in a leaderless group was seen as more sympathetic and more concerned with others' feelings than was the male leader, an attribution that stereotypically accompanies female behavior and forms expectations for that behavior.

What is noteworthy in the profiles comparing a male leader and females (either non-leaders or those in a leaderless group), is that attributes became salient in these comparisons that had not been important when males were compared with males. In both sets of comparisons involving females, the qualities "concerned with others' feelings," and/or "sympathetic" were important, neither of which were important in comparisons involving males. Whether the significance of these socio-emotional criteria lies in the idea that females were seen as being sympathetic instead of being dominant, or as sympathetic in addition to being dominant, is not clear. The impact for females and for males is significant nonetheless. Females may find that their dominant behavior is seen as other than dominant; males may find that their sympathetic behavior is perceived as dominance rather than sympathy.

The pattern of profiles resulting from comparisons with the female leader was similar to the pattern from comparisons with the male leader. The female leader, when compared with the male non-leader, was seen as more of an initiator, more strong-willed, more self-assured, more important to the group task, and more decisive than was the male non-leader. Present in this set of comparisons were qualities similar to those used to distinguish a male leader from a male non-leader, and which emphasized activity and confidence in a leader. Absent from this profile were any references to the socio-emotional qualities which had proven to be significant in comparisons involving females earlier. Apparently, having leadership designation made an important difference in perceptions of the female leader. The emphasis in leadership qualities which emerges from this profile stresses the importance of that designation for women if they seek clarity in others' perceptions of them as leaders. It also decreases the likelihood of their behavior being seen as sympathetic, which may or may not be their goal.

Comparisons of female leaders with females revealed similar patterns to those of male leaders compared with females. The female leader, when compared with the female non-leader, was seen as more of an initiator, more strong-willed, and more important to the group task, all of which qualities had appeared as important when the female leader was compared with the male non-leader. In addition, the female leader was seen as less flirtatious, less emotional, more unlikely to ask for help, and more competent than the female non-leader. Stated conversely, this comparison emphasizes current stereotypes about women, for those females who were not leaders, but nonetheless acted dominant, were perceived as more flirtatious, more emotional, more likely to ask for help, and less competent, as well as less of an initiator, less strong-willed, and less important to the group task. Since these qualities are at the heart of stereo-

types about women, it seems even more important that women are appointed/elected to leadership positions in order to be perceived as dominant and powerful.

As in the profiles comparing the male leader with a male and a female in a leaderless group, only three criteria distinguished the female leader from a female in a leaderless group. The female leader was seen as more strong-willed, less concerned with others' feelings, and more important to the group task. Only one of these distinctions concerns a quality of leadership; the other two are concerned with personality traits and socio-emotional qualities. The parallel is striking between the criteria salient in this set of profiles and those in the set which compared the male leader with the female in a leaderless group. It underscores the image of the woman who acts dominant in a group without having leadership designation as being seen as overly dominant and/or as caring for others' feelings, thus highlighting the different stereotypes people may have of dominant-acting women.

The pattern that emerged from comparisons between female leaders and males and females without leadership designation is both quantitatively and qualitatively similar to that which emerged from comparisons between male leaders and males and females without leadership designation. As role ambiguity increased, salient qualities became more stereotypic. When the female leader was compared with the male non-leader, leadership qualities were important, as they had been when the male leader was compared with the male non-leader. When the female leader was compared with the female non-leader, leadership and personality qualities surfaced, again as they had in similar comparisons involving the male leader. When the female leader was compared with the female in a leaderless gorup, leadership perceptions decreased, and personality and socio-emotional qualities increased, as had happened in the set of comparisons involving the male leader and the female in a leaderless group. Ingeneral, what distinguished females without leadership

designation from male and female leaders was emotionalism and concern for others' feelings, neither of which are leadership qualities. What was salient in comparing both male and female leaders with males without leadership designation was self-assurance, a personality trait which enhances leadership.

The overall pattern which emerges from these profiles emphasizes the quandry that women who seek leadership positions must face. On the one hand, dominant behavior, and especially dominant behavior with leadership designation, is perceived in terms of "masculine" qualities, for males as well as females. Thus, women who attain such designation are seen, at least in comparison with men, as initiators, leaders, important to group task, and so on. But the price of achieving such clarity is the loss of attributions which traditionally have accompanied femininity and which in the profiles were evidenced in comparisons with other females--sympathy and concern for others' feelings, and personality characteristics which are associated with these socio-emotional qualities. What a male may give up in acting dominant when he does not have leadership designation are potentially favorable impressions of his intelligence; the cost to a female may be the lack of recognition of a significant portion of her personality and a forced choice on her part between power and femininity. It is little wonder that a common choice of women who have the option of becoming leaders is to avoid doing so. There are costs to be paid no matter what choice she makes, and these same costs are apparently not paid by males.

The last set of profiles in the study emphasizes the "masculine" nature of leadership, for the qualities which were seen to distinguish a leader from a non-leader revolved around typically masculine attributes. In these comparisons, the leader was seen as more of an initiator, more self-assured, more important to the group task, more competent, more of a leader, more strong-willed, more unlikely

to ask for help, more intelligent, less emotional, less flirtatious, and more manipulative than was the non-leader. The preponderance of "masculine" qualities in this profile underscores the idea emphasized in other profiles that leadership and activity in a group is a "masculine" activity.

In comparing a leader to a leaderless group member, only two qualities were important. The leader was seen as less dominant and more important to the group task. This was the only instance in all the profiles where "dominance" was important. In this case, the attribute was given to a group member who acted dominant when there was no leader. Such behavior without "legitimacy" apparently promotes strong reactions.

Conclusions and Implications

A number of conclusions may be drawn from this study, with implications for both male and female behavior in groups.

First, it was clear in these analyses that dominant behavior was seen as a "masculine" entity, and having leadership designation made it even more so. All of the figures being compared in this study acted dominant; the differences among them stemmed from sex and leadership designation. The distinctions made among them indicated that those with leadership designation were seen as more "masculine" or less "feminine" than those who did not have it. The noteworthy exception to this finding was the attribute "manipulative" which was given to leaders in general, and male leaders in particular in this study. In the context of this study, it was seen as a "masculine" quality. The qualities which distinguished leaders from non-leaders, and male and female leaders from male non-leaders, concerned "masculine" qualities. "Feminine" qualities were primarily

salient in comparisons with females.

Second, it was also apparent from these analyses that leadership designation is crucial to those who seek to be seen as influential in groups. Leaders were distinguished from those who acted dominant without leadership designation on the basis of "masculine" qualities--initiation of action, importance to group task, and so on. More criteria distinguished those who acted dominant in a group where someone else was the designated leader than distinguished those who acted dominant in a leaderless group, when each was compared with the leader. Apparently, it was seen as "worse" to act dominant when someone else was the designated leader than it was to act dominant when no one was the leader.

Third, the sex of the dominant-acting person was also found to be important in this study, even though leadership designation had an overriding influence. Although male and female leaders were perceived as similar, when they were compared to each other, differences did emerge when they were compared to those without leadership designation, and these differences varied by sex. Socio-emotional qualities became salient in the profiles when comparisons to females were made; such distinctions were not needed in comparisons between male leaders and males. It became apparent in these comparisons that an additional, or even alternative, set of criteria was important in comparisons involving females which was not important in comparisons between males. It also became evident that males and females were not perceived as "opposites," despite stereotypic expectations that they might be. In those cases where significant differences were found, it was because one or the other of them possessed significantly more or less of a quality, not because, for example, one was seen as important to the group task and the other unimportant.

Fourth, leadership designation was important for males and females for different reasons. Males needed it to be seen as intelligent in comparison with other males and as possessing a variety of leadership attributes. Females needed it to lessen the possibility of their behavior being seen as other than or as extra-dominant. The "price" of leadership designation appears to be greater for females than for males. It appears that females may have to choose between power and attributes characteristic of their sex, for in this study women were seen as either leaders or as being sympathetic, depending on whether their dominant behavior accompanied leadership or not. For males, this was not the case. Whatever the price, both males and females need leadership designation in order to be seen as leaders. Those who wish to be seen as sympathetic as well, whether male or female, have an additional problem to solve.

Finally, perceptions of males and females in situations with role ambiguity concerning leadership designation emphasized the need for that designation. As role ambiguity increased, perceptions of males and females tended more toward the stereotypic, especially for females. What distinguished both male and female leaders from males and females in leaderless groups were only a few qualities, but those that were salient indicated that the male was distinguished on the basis of leadership and personality qualities, while the female was distinguished on the basis of socio-emotional qualities. In the interest of decreasing stereotypic perceptions, leadership designation is needed.

Recommendations

This study determined that leadership designation was more important than

sex of dominant-acting person in observers' perceptions of dominance in a group. It indicated as well that sex of dominant-acting person can have an effect on observers' perceptions of males and females in a group in areas other than dominance. These indications warrant further investigation since they are of potential importance to both males and females who seek leadership in groups. Research questions which are pertinent to this area of investigation and which would serve to clarify the indications found here include the following:

1. Do other kinds of dominant behaviors, such as eye contact, generate the same perceptions when used in the same context as the one in this study? If so, what does that reveal about perceptions of sex, dominance, and leadership in groups?

2. Do the perceptions of touching behavior remain the same in other contexts? That is, if the story which "set the stage" for this study described a different kind of scene, would the results have been the same? If so, this would lend support to the conclusions reached here. If not, what makes the difference, and how might that be further pinpointed?

3. In what contexts are "feminine" qualities valued for males and for females?

4. Do non-dominant behaviors generate the same responses from observers? If so, what does this say about sex and leadership designation in groups?

5. What more can be learned about perceptions of males and females in leaderless groups? What are the dynamics of acting dominant when one is in a leaderless group?

6. Do the perceptions of males and females found in this study apply in other contexts? That is, can one construct a profile of a male or a female which holds true across contexts? If so, then dominant behavior was not the triggering event here, but sex was.

This study was an initial attempt at pinpointing more clearly the specifics of perceptions people have of male and female dominant behavior in groups. As such, it indicated that leadership designation, more than sex of dominant-acting person, was important for certain perceptions. It indicated, as well, that males and females who use identical behavior in various conditions of leadership designation may be perceived differently in small groups. Further examination of the significance and the impact of the differential perceptions people have of males and females in groups appears to be warranted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baird, Hohn E., Jr. "Sex differences in group communication: A review of relevant research." Quarterly Journal of Speech, April 1976, 62, 179-92.

Bardwick, Judith, and Elixabeth Douvan. "Ambivalence: The socialization of women," in Woman in sexist society, V. Cornick and B. Moran, eds. New York: Basic Books, 1971, pp. 225-41.

Bartol, Kathryn M. "Male vs. female leaders: The effect of leader need for dominance on follower satisfaction." Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17, 225-33.

Bormann, Ernest G., Jerie Pratt, and Linda Putnam. "Power, authority, and sex: Male response to female leadership." Communication Monographs, 1978, 45, 119-55.

Butt, D.S., and D.W. Fiske. "Comparison of strategies in developing scales for dominance." Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 505-19.

Deaux, Kay. The behavior of women and men. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks-Cole, 1976.

Denmark, Florence L. "Styles of leadership." Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2, 99-113.

Eakins, Barbara W., and R. Gene Eakins. Sex differences in human communication. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1978.

Frances, Susan. "SEx differences in nonverbal behavior." Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 12-19.

Frieze, Irene H., and Sheila J. Ramsey. "Nonverbal maintenance of traditional sex roles." Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 133-41.

Henley,Nancy M. Body politics: Power, sex and nonverbal communication. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Henley, Nancy M., and Jo Freeman. "The sexual politics of interpersonal behavior," in Women: A feminist perspective. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield, 1975, pp. 391-401.

Knapp, Mark. Nonverbal communication in human interaction, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1978.

LaFrance, Marianne, and Clara Mayo. "A review of nonverbal behaviors of women and men." Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1979, 43, 96-107.

Mehrabian, Albert. "Significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationship." Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71, 359-72.

Spiegel, Hohn, and Pavel Machotka. Messages of the Body. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Walum, Laurel Richardson. The dynamics of sex and gender: A sociological perspective. Chicage: Rand McNally, 1977.